



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/859,716	05/17/2001	Raymond S. Wach	EMPO4-27	4114
58406 7590 06/19/2008 BARRY W. CHAPIN, ESQ. CHAPIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, LLC WESTBOROUGH OFFICE PARK 1700 WEST PARK DRIVE, SUITE 280 WESTBOROUGH, MA 01581			EXAMINER TAYLOR, NICHOLAS R	
			ART UNIT 2141	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/19/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/859,716

**Applicant(s)**

WACH, RAYMOND S.

**Examiner**

NICHOLAS TAYLOR

**Art Unit**

2141

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2007.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-7, 11-15, 19, 22-25, 29, 32-35, 37 and 38 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-7, 11-15, 19, 22-25, 29, 32-35, 37 and 38 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☒ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1, 4-7, 11-15, 19, 22-25, 29, 32-35, 37, and 38 have been presented for examination and are rejected.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed April 23rd, 2007, have been fully considered but they are deemed not persuasive.
3. In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that:

(A) The combination of the prior art of Hubbard and Acker is improper, as there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the references. Further, the references are classified in different class/subclass combinations.

As to point (A), Hubbard is directed to a method for network site testing that identifies the capabilities of distributed devices connected together through a wide variety of networks (e.g., see Hubbard, abstract). Acker teaches a method of performing distributed network testing of object-oriented software components that are usable to build an application (Acker, fig. 1; col. 3, lines 41-57; col. 4, lines 48-60, e.g., in a similar setting such as over the internet as per col. 3, lines 57-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to

have combined Hubbard and Acker to provide the method of Acker in the system of Hubbard, because doing so would enable a method of desirable distributed software component validation and verification (Acker, col. 2, lines 38-44) in a system that is designed to implement distributed network tasks (Hubbard, col. 3, lines 4-18). As to the argument that the references originate from different classifications, the classification of a reference does not limit or restrict the applicability of the disclosure's content in a combination under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Regardless, both references share similar fields of search (see 707 and 709 overlap).

(B) The prior art of Hubbard, Acker, and Sharon fails to disclose providing load to a target. Hubbard describes testing of a network site whereas Acker discloses "functional" testing of a software component. Applicant's specification defines "load" to comprise providing a predetermined number of virtual users which perform a variety of functions or transactions with the target.

As to point (B), Hubbard teaches deploying said first and said second system at the scheduled time, said first and said second system providing load to said target (Hubbard, col. 15, lines 27-59 and fig. 5B). Additionally, Acker teaches a method of performing distributed testing of object-oriented software components that are usable to build an application (Acker, fig. 1; col. 3, lines 41-57; col. 4, lines 48-60). Acker achieves this testing by providing a load to the target component (see Acker, col. 4, lines 25-47). As to the argument that applicant's specification provides a limited

definition of the term "load", although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

(C) The prior art of Hubbard, Acker, and Sharon fails to disclose performing distributed monitoring of an object oriented software component usable to build an application.

As to point (C), Acker teaches a method of performing distributed testing of object-oriented software components that are usable to build an application (Acker, fig. 1; col. 3, lines 41-57; col. 4, lines 48-60). Acker achieves this testing by providing a load to the target component (see Acker, col. 4, lines 25-47).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 4-7, 11-15, 19, 22-25, 29, 32-35, 37, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hubbard (U.S. Patent 6,891,802) and Sharon et al. (U.S. Patent 6,137,782), further in view of Acker et al. (U.S. Patent 6,684,387).

6. As per claims 1 and 19, Hubbard teaches a method of performing distributed testing of a target (Hubbard, col. 4, lines 15-31) comprising the steps of:

identifying a first and a second system which meets a predetermined criteria (Hubbard, col. 15, line 60 to col. 16, line 22, and fig. 6A and 6B), said first system having a different owner than an owner of said target and an owner of said second system; (Hubbard, col. 5, lines 53-57, and col. 6, lines 9-19)

scheduling said first and second system to provide load to said target, said target comprising an object-oriented software component; and (Hubbard, col. 15, line 27 to col. 16, line 22, and fig. 6A, 6B, and 5B)

deploying said first and said second system at the scheduled time, said first and said second system providing load to said target (Hubbard, col. 15, lines 27-59 and fig. 5B).

However, Hubbard fails to teach wherein:

the predetermined criteria include a physical location of said system, and an object-oriented software component that is usable to build an application.

Acker teaches a method of performing distributed testing of object-oriented software components that are usable to build an application (Acker, fig. 1; col. 3, lines 41-57; col. 4, lines 48-60). Acker achieves this testing by providing a load to the target component (see Acker, col. 4, lines 25-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Hubbard and Acker to provide the method of Acker in the system of Hubbard, because doing so would enable a method of desirable

distributed software component validation and verification (Acker, col. 2, lines 38-44) in a system that is designed to implement distributed network tasks (Hubbard, col. 3, lines 4-18).

Sharon teaches a method of testing and analyzing network traffic based on physical system location (Sharon, col. 4, line 64 to col. 5, line 33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Hubbard-Acker and Sharon to provide the physical location-based analysis of Sharon in the system of Hubbard-Acker, because doing so would enable traffic flow analysis through a distributed network according to physical topology (Sharon, col. 2, lines 59-64).

7. As per claims 4 and 22, Hubbard-Acker-Sharon teaches the system further wherein said predetermined criteria further include additional criteria selected from the group comprising: sizes of said systems, speeds of said systems (Hubbard, col. 16, lines 24-34 and table 1), and availability of said systems (Hubbard, col. 11, lines 16-26).

8. As per claims 5 and 23, Hubbard-Acker-Sharon teaches the system further wherein said first and said second system provides load across a network to said target (Hubbard, col. 15, lines 27-59 and fig. 5B).

9. As per claims 6 and 24, Hubbard-Acker-Sharon teaches the system further including the step of defining a catalog of potential systems which meet said

Art Unit: 2145

predetermined criteria and wherein said step of identifying a first and second system is performed from said catalog of potential systems (Hubbard, col. 15, line 60 to col. 16, line 22, and fig. 6A and 6B).

10. As per claims 7 and 25, Hubbard-Acker-Sharon teaches the system further wherein said software component is selected from the group consisting of EJB, Corba, COM, DCOM and COM+ (Acker, col. 3, lines 41-57).

11. As per claims 11 and 29, Hubbard teaches a method of performing distributed monitoring of a target (Hubbard, col. 4, lines 15-31) comprising the steps of:

identifying a first and a second system which meets a predetermined criteria (Hubbard, col. 15, line 60 to col. 16, line 22, and fig. 6A and 6B), said first system having a different owner than said target and an owner of said second system; (Hubbard, col. 5, lines 53-57, and col. 6, lines 9-19)

scheduling said first and said second system to monitor said target; and (Hubbard, col. 15, line 60 to col. 16, line 22, and fig. 6A and 6B)

deploying said first and said second system at the scheduled time, said first and said second system providing monitor functions to said target, said target comprising an object-oriented software component (Hubbard, col. 15, line 27 to col. 16, line 22, and fig. 6A, 6B, and 5B).

However, Hubbard fails to teach wherein:

the predetermined criteria include a physical location of said system, and



an object-oriented software component that is usable to build an application.

Acker teaches a method of performing distributed testing of object-oriented software components that are usable to build an application (Acker, fig. 1; col. 3, lines 41-57; col. 4, lines 48-60). Acker achieves this testing by providing a load to the target component (see Acker, col. 4, lines 25-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Hubbard and Acker to provide the method of Acker in the system of Hubbard, because doing so would enable a method of desirable distributed software component validation and verification (Acker, col. 2, lines 38-44) in a system that is designed to implement distributed network tasks (Hubbard, col. 3, lines 4-18).

Sharon teaches a method of testing and analyzing network traffic based on physical system location (Sharon, col. 4, line 64 to col. 5, line 33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Hubbard-Acker and Sharon to provide the physical location-based analysis of Sharon in the system of Hubbard-Acker, because doing so would enable traffic flow analysis through a distributed network according to physical topology (Sharon, col. 2, lines 59-64).

12. As per claim 12, Hubbard-Acker-Sharon teaches the system further wherein said target comprises a web site (Hubbard, col. 15, lines 27-59 and fig. 5B).

13. As per claims 13 and 32, Hubbard-Acker-Sharon teaches the system further wherein said predetermined criteria further include additional criteria selected from the group comprising: sizes of at least one of said first and said second system, speeds of at least one of said first and said second system (Hubbard, col. 16, lines 24-34 and table 1), and availability of at least one of said first and said second system (Hubbard, col. 11, lines 16-26).

14. As per claim 14, Hubbard-Acker-Sharon teaches the system further wherein said first and said second system provides monitor functions across a network to said target (Hubbard, col. 15, lines 27-59 and fig. 5B).

15. As per claims 15 and 33, Hubbard-Acker-Sharon teaches the system further including the step of defining a catalog of potential system which meet said predetermined criteria and wherein said step of identifying a first and a second system is performed from said catalog of potential systems (Hubbard, col. 15, line 60 to col. 16, line 22, and fig. 6A and 6B).

16. As per claim 34, Hubbard-Acker-Sharon teaches the system further wherein said software component is selected from the group consisting of EJB, CORBA, COM, DCOM, and COM+ (Acker, col. 3, lines 41-57).

17. As per claim 35, Hubbard-Acker-Sharon teaches the system further wherein said systems provide load across a network to said target (Hubbard, col. 15, lines 27-59 and fig. 5B).

18. As per claims 37 and 38, Hubbard-Acker-Sharon teaches the system further wherein said providing load emulates a real world environment (Hubbard, col. 18, lines 23-40).

### ***Conclusion***

19. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Taylor whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 2145

3889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am to 5:30pm, with alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/NT/  
Nicholas Taylor  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2141

/Jason D Cardone/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145